

Mozambique - Community Land Use Fund

Report generated on: January 7, 2016

Visit our data catalog at: <https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php>

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY

Mozambique

EVALUATION TITLE

Community Land Use Fund

EVALUATION TYPE

Independent Performance Evaluation

ID NUMBER

DDI-MCC-MOZ-ED-ITC-2013-v01

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION

Not applicable to this evaluation; no quantitative data to be shared

Overview

ABSTRACT

This evaluation focuses on the ITC (Community Land Fund) outcomes in two iTC/G6 provinces (Manica and Cabo Delgado) and one iTC/MCA province (Zambézia). The evaluator used what it called a 'Outcomes Harvesting' approach and method. The evaluator identified program objectives and then sought to uncover or 'harvest' outcomes corresponding to specific, measurable changes in the behavior and relations of communities and their organizations, outcomes which the activities and interventions of KPMG and its service providers contributed to being realized. Overall, the evaluation harvested 171 outcomes, triangulated from multiple sources and found that iTC contributed to these successful outcomes at the community level.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Other (Performance Evaluation)

UNITS OF ANALYSIS

Community

KIND OF DATA

Sample survey data [ssd]

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Land	MCC Sector	
Gender	MCC Sector	

KEYWORDS

Land use, Land rights, Land security

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

The initial phase starting in 2006 covered Manica, Gaza and Cabo Delgado Provinces with Tete and Sofala provinces added in 2010. The Millennium Challenge Account extended iTC's activities (iTC/MCA) in a second phase into Nampula, Niassa and Zambézia.

UNIVERSE

Individuals living in project-targeted provinces.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Effective Development Group	ED

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	
UK Department for International Development	DFID	
Swiss Agency for Development	SDC	
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	SIDA	
Irish Aid		
Netherlands Ministry of Development Cooperation		
Danish International Development Agency	DANIDA	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Metadata Producer

DATE OF METADATA PRODUCTION

2014-05-27

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION

Version 1.0

DDI DOCUMENT ID

DDI-MCC-MOZ-ED-ITC-2013-v01

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD

Mozambique

PROGRAM

The Mozambique Community Land Use Fund (Iniciativa para Terras Comunitárias, or iTC) began in June 2006 and continued until December 2014 with financing totalling £15.1 million from seven donors¹. The initial phase covered Manica, Gaza and Cabo Delgado Provinces with Tete and Sofala provinces added in 2010. The Millennium Challenge Account extended iTC's activities (iTC/MCA) in a second phase into Nampula, Niassa and Zambézia. KPMG/National Research Institute (NRI) manages both iTC's G6 and MCA programme components. The iTC's objectives are: 1. To assist communities in identifying and protecting their land rights and ensuring their access to natural resources, 2. To target priority geographical areas with significant economic potential, 3. To combine land rights delimitation and land use planning to identify potential sites for investment, 4. To link communities with investors and development institutions, and 5. To align iTC interventions with district plans and financing opportunities. The iTC largely focused on providing increased tenure security, while preparing communities for investments in infrastructure, natural resource management and producer associations to support their own investments and partnership-based productive investments with external investors.

MCC SECTOR

Land (Land)

PROGRAM LOGIC

Output 1.1--Number of delimited community lands and demarcated association lands Output 1.2--Reduction of per hectare cost of delimitations and demarcations Output 1.3--Number of Community-Investor Negotiations that the ITC has directly generated Output 2.1--Plan for lessons learning and policy dialogue developed and implemented Output 3.1--Number of Service Providers trained Output 3.2--Number of Service Providers trained with ITC support Output 3.3--Legal and organisational basis for new institution prepared Outcome 1--Preparation of Communities Outcome 2--Preparation of Associations Outcome 3--Investments directly influenced by ITC Outcome 4--ITC Capacities Outcome 5--Empowerment

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

In total 638 communities and 740,000 people have benefited from the project over the period 2006-13.

Sampling

Study Population

Individuals living in project-targeted provinces.

Sampling Procedure

In Manica, the evaluation sampled five of the 13 completed ITC contracts which involved community or association land interventions. 12 sites were sampled within the five contracts. Thus the Manica sample covers completed delimitation interventions (involving community boundary delimitation, social preparation, CGRN formation) and completed demarcation interventions (involving legalization of associations, social preparation, and demarcation of association claimed land). The sample was stratified: one half comprised communities from pre-2010 interventions and the other half from 2010-2012 interventions. One community site was included specifically because it was the only case where the CGRN had reached three agreements with outside investors, and was thus of major interest for the evaluation.

In Zambézia, the sample selection started with a decision to cover the 6 of the thirteen contracts which had finished and had final reports. However, the Service providers for one had no staff member in the areas following the end of its ITC contract. That contract was excluded and replaced with another contract managed by the same service providers that was near completion and for which a final report was provided to the ET by the end of fieldwork. Zambézia contracts were generally for large areas under the overall authority of a regulo 1 (regulos) or local leader or chief and members of that area all recognized his overall authority. Under these areas, communities or povoações were identified individually and were assisted by service providers either individually or in some cases in groups of 2 or more communities (facilitating service provider work and reducing costs). Delimitations, however, were done at the community level so that lower level regulos had the boundaries of their communities delimited in individual delimitations rather than as a single delimitation of the area of the whole community covered by the regulo 1. Within the six contracts, the team contacted a total of 22 communities. It met with as many of the CGRNs and associations (pre-existing and those formed by ITC) as possible, without regard to whether or not they had land demarcated to them. Some outcomes refer to areas covered by a regulo 1 and the larger administrative area under the regulo. Separate meetings were held with CGRNs and associations. Outcomes for CGRNs and associations refer to the specific association or CGRN and because of service providers' grouping of povoações for carrying out their work, might cover more than one povoação. Specific communities (povoações or larger localidades), associations and CGRNs were selected by the team. The team interviewed those associations (including older associations which did not demarcate land) found within selected povacões even though ITC only identifies those which it legalized or demarcated.

In Cabo Delgado 6 projects were selected. However most of these projects were clusters created during the contract process to expedite, facilitate and reduce costs. As such, various communities (often non-contiguous) with diverse land-related issues were included in the same contract. One community was selected in each of the clusters. ITC listed 23 contracts that ITC provided. Three did not have approved final reports. Thus selection of the 6 was from the universe of 20 contracts for which final reports were available.

Questionnaires

Overview

Household questionnaire at the community level

Semi-structured interviews with the CGRN (Community Natural Resource Management Committee)

Semi-structured interviews with government representatives

Semi-structured interviews with investors

Semi-structured interviews with Community Associations

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
-------	-----	-------

Questionnaires

Household questionnaire at the community level

Semi-structured interviews with the CGRN (Community Natural Resource Management Committee)

Semi-structured interviews with government representatives

Semi-structured interviews with investors

Semi-structured interviews with Community Associations

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
Effective Development Group	ED	

Supervision

The evaluation was led by Jeff Dorsey. Other key evaluation members include: David Stanfield; Ingrid Nelson, Esme Joaquim and Andrew Koleros.

The field survey workers were: Helder Daniel Victorino, Ines Pedro Salimo, Ana Moniz Amone, Nelsson Paulo Trocinho, Dramusse Sale, Elisa Filismina, E. C. Mesa, Bulaiton Zivale, Baulene Artur, Cristovão Francisco Gibante, Maria Cristina João Domingos Camisola, Verónica Delfina Nhica, Adélia da Conceição Muataco, Lucas Francisco da Silva Massiuana, Adêncio Jesuino Tomas Adêncio, Amarildo José Alberto Lobo, Danilo Félix Santos Júlio, Paulina Jaime and Paulina Luís.

Data Processing

Other Processing

Condesse Eugenio da Silva, Yolanda Laura Ganhane, and Tercio Jose Alberto Lobo entered data into various survey databases.

Data Appraisal

No content available